UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

THIRD COMMITTEE
32nd meeting
held on
Friday, 12 November 1993
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 32nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KUKAN (Slovakia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 111: ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 107: ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 108: RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION (continued)

(a) RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION (continued)

(b) EFFECTIVE REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION THROUGH AUTONOMY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 109: SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION AND TO YOUTH, AGEING, DISABLED PERSONS AND THE FAMILY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 110: CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within *one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/48/SR.32
25 January 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

93-82358 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 111: ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (continued) (A/48/3 (Chap. VII.C), A/48/38, A/48/98, A/48/124-S/25506, A/48/182, A/48/187-E/1993/76, A/48/279, A/48/301, A/48/338, A/48/354, A/48/359, A/48/413, A/48/513, A/48/546, A/C.3/48/L.5)

1. Mr. MUHAMMAD (Malaysia) said that Malaysia attached great importance to the Fourth World Conference on Women and had set up a preparatory committee. The Conference should consider the various obstacles to the advancement of women, particularly women in rural areas. Member States must make every effort to promote the social and economic advancement of rural women. Malaysia was to host a regional workshop on rural women and a meeting of First Ladies of Asia and the Pacific in December 1993.

2. Malaysia viewed with deep concern the increasing violence against women, violence which had a high and intolerable human and economic cost. Action must be taken both nationally and internationally to address the problem. Malaysia had amended its Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Act so that rape trials would be held in camera and crimes against women would be punished with prison terms of five to twenty years. A bill providing legal protection for victims of domestic violence would shortly be submitted to the Parliament.

3. With regard to improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat, the representation of women had shown a marginal increase even at the Under-Secretary-General level. The Malaysian delegation encouraged the Secretary-General to pursue his efforts to reach the target of 35 per cent overall participation by 1995.

4. The report of the Task Force on the United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) (E/1993/82) pointed out the advantages and difficulties of merging the two bodies. There should be broadly based consultations before any decision was taken in the matter.

5. Mrs. RADUCHOWSKA-BROCHWICZ (Poland) said that her delegation noted with satisfaction the priority given in the United Nations system to activities related to the advancement of women. It commended the work of the Commission on the Status of Women and welcomed the convening of the Fourth World Conference on Women, which would provide an opportunity to give impetus to the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies.

6. Despite the efforts of many countries to give women equal opportunities, they continued to suffer discrimination and denial of their rights. Women were a crucial factor in the workforce but they did not enjoy the same rights as men. Poland endorsed all United Nations activities aimed at the elaboration of methods of comparing the value of jobs done by men and women. Support must also be given to women in urban areas by ensuring that their fundamental rights were respected and that they were not regarded merely as recipients of charity.

(Mrs. Raduchowska-Brochwicz, Poland)

7. The Polish Government reaffirmed its support of the draft declaration on the elimination of violence against women.

8. The transition from a State-controlled to a market economy in Central and Eastern Europe was working to the detriment of women. Poland and other countries of the region needed technical assistance to help them overcome the adverse effects of the transition. UNIFEM was helping with the integration of women in development. Therefore, the Polish delegation proposed that the Committee should consider the possibility of expanding some of the UNIFEM projects to encompass women in the countries in transition.

9. Discussion of the merging of INSTRAW and UNIFEM would be premature until a report of the Secretary-General on the subject was available.

10. Mrs. DROZD (Belarus) said that despite the efforts of the United Nations to secure respect for the human rights of women, they continued in their millions to suffer discrimination in the exercise of their civil and political rights.

11. As a State party to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Belarus supported the appeal of the World Conference on Human Rights for the elimination of such discrimination and for women to be given greater access to senior posts and a greater say in the taking of economic and political decisions. The delegation of Belarus believed that the United Nations would achieve by 1995 the target for the percentage of women in the Secretariat and thus set an example to the world community.

12. Belarus fully supported the draft declaration on the elimination of violence against women and welcomed the initiative of the Commission on Human Rights to appoint a special rapporteur on the problem of violence against women.

13. It also welcomed the system-wide medium-term plan for the advancement of women for the period 1996-2001 which contained concrete measures for the effective integration of women in development. The plan should be updated and include a research and control programme with regard to the health of women affected by ecological disasters, including the Chernobyl disaster.

14. The Chernobyl disaster had caused serious diseases among women in Belarus, depriving many of them of the chance of motherhood and undermining the health of pregnant women and newborn children. The number of deliveries with complications had increased by 30 per cent. The morbidity rate among newborn children had risen by 40 per cent. The number of children suffering from thyroid-gland cancer was increasing sharply, as were the incidences of immunological deficiency, anaemia and other ailments. Cases of thyroid-gland cancer had risen by a factor of 52 since 1986.

15. For many years Belarus would suffer great human, natural and financial losses. An effort by the international community would help to save the lives of thousands of people.

(Mrs. Drozd, Belarus)

16. In the run-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women it was of great importance to take coordinated action for the advancement of women. To that end, an international seminar on women in development had been held in Minsk; it had manifested the deep and growing concern of society about women's issues.

17. Ms. TOLLE (Kenya) said that women had suffered discrimination throughout history. Today, the discrimination against women in education, health care, job opportunities, decision-making, and inheritance required the attention of the international community.

18. Violence against women was rampant throughout the world. Crimes such as rape, incest, genital mutilation, and female infanticide often went unpunished in certain societies, while in others they were regarded as defensible despite their effects on the victims and their families.

19. The growing problem of the abuse and violence inflicted on women was a world-wide one and constituted a challenge to the international community. Member States must devise national and international mechanisms to encourage respect for women. The Kenyan delegation endorsed the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna.

20. After briefly describing the situation of women in Kenya, she said that her Government had established a task force to make recommendations that would facilitate the enacting of amendments to existing laws which discriminated against women. The Government was implementing structural adjustment programmes to minimize poverty, malnutrition and disease but it would have to proceed cautiously because it would need external financing on realistic terms.

21. The Fourth World Conference on Women could not be a success unless the non-governmental organizations participated fully in the preparations and deliberations. In conclusion, she announced that Kenya had established a National Committee to coordinate the country's activities on behalf of the Conference and said that her Government would support the Platform for Action to be discussed at Beijing.

AGENDA ITEM 107: ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.14: Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid

22. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had no financial implications for the programme budget.

23. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

24. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.14 was adopted by 103 votes to 1, with 46 abstentions.

25. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Economic Community, said that the abstention from voting of the countries members of the EEC in no way detracted from their total condemnation of apartheid. None of the members of the EEC was a party to the Convention because, although all were in full support of that instrument's objectives, they had serious reservations as to the means stipulated therein.

26. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that since apartheid was fading away, it was inappropriate to continue to call on States to accede to the Convention. Support for future efforts would serve the cause of peace in South Africa better than dwelling on the past.

27. Ms. DIAKITE (Mali) said that by mistake she had voted against the draft resolution. She had intended to vote for it.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.16: Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had no financial implications for the programme budget. He announced that Costa Rica, Egypt, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Nigeria and Pakistan had joined the sponsors.

29. Mr. TOMIČ (Slovenia), speaking on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, and of Honduras, introduced an amendment replacing the words "Welcomes also" in operative paragraph 3 by the word "Notes".

30. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.16, as orally amended, was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 108: RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION (continued)

(a) RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.12: Use of mercenaries as a means to violate human rights and to impede the exercise of the rights of peoples to self-determination

31. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had no financial implications for the programme budget. He announced that Malawi had joined the sponsors. He recalled that the representative of Cuba, speaking on behalf of the co-sponsors, had orally amended the draft resolution, placing paragraph 4 of the operative part, with the addition of the word "deeply" before the word "concerned", between the ninth and tenth paragraphs of the preamble, the remaining operative paragraphs being renumbered accordingly.

32. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

33. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.12 was adopted by 100 votes to 14, with 35 abstentions.

34. Mr. SNEGOR (Republic of Moldova) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because the question was not a merely theoretical one for the Republic of Moldova. After independence, hundreds of foreign mercenaries had participated in the military conflict in the eastern part of his country, fighting against the Government's army and police units.

35. Mr. STEFANOV (Bulgaria) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because, although Bulgaria supported condemnation of the recruitment, use or financing of mercenaries, in his delegation's view the proposed text resembled that of General Assembly resolution 47/84 which contained controversial elements and did not reflect recent positive developments in the world.

36. Mr. CRAPATULCAN (Romania), speaking in explanation of his vote, said that although Romania had always condemned the use of mercenaries, he had voted against the draft resolution because not only did it not take into account the positive developments in some parts of the world but it also requested the Centre for Human Rights to hold working meetings the purpose of which was not at all clear.

37. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the countries members of the European Economic Community, said that the draft resolution had introduced controversial elements not germane to the Convention. Given the financial restrictions on the Centre for Human Rights, the EEC had reservations about operative paragraph 10. She repeated that the best context in which to examine the question of mercenaries was that of relations between States, not that of human rights.

38. Ms. DOZCDOYAN (Armenia) said that by mistake she had voted against the draft resolution although she had wished to vote for it.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.15: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

39. The CHAIRMAN said that Albania, Saudi Arabia and Honduras had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

40. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.15 was adopted without a vote.

41. Mrs. MURUGESAN (India), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had not opposed the adoption of the draft resolution but had not changed its position in respect of article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Her Government had declared that the words "the right of self-determination" appearing in that article applied only to peoples under foreign domination and not to sovereign States or to a section of a people or nation.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.19: Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights

42. Mr. BUBBA (Iraq), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation had reservations with respect to the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

43. Mr. ATASHI (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the changes that had been made in the draft resolution in comparison with resolutions of the same title adopted in former years did not properly reflect the historic changes taking place in the Middle East. A resolution which called for "the struggle ... by all available means" was not conducive to negotiations, but was bound to encourage the continuation of violence. Therefore, Israel would once again vote against the draft resolution.

44. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Croatia, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Ireland, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay.

45. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.19 was adopted by 87 votes to 25, with 34 abstentions.

46. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the European Economic Community, said that the draft resolution did not adequately take into account the recent developments which could lead to peaceful solutions. The delegations which she represented disagreed with paragraph 2, which reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples by all available means; the United Nations should, above all, encourage the search for peaceful solutions.

47. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because it did not reflect the positive developments now under way in South Africa and placed sole blame on Israel for past violence.

48. Mr. DA SILVA (Venezuela) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but would have preferred it more if it had more adequately reflected the Washington Declaration of Principles between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

49. Mr. BRAHA (Albania) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because it did not fully reflect the recent positive developments in South Africa and in the Middle East.

50. Mr. REZVANI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it had strong reservations regarding the last preambular paragraph. His delegation believed that the recent agreements would not lead to the full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

51. Mr. KASOULIDES (Cyprus) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but stressed that Cyprus supported the latest agreement between Israel and the Palestinians and believed that the Committee should encourage the peace process.

52. Mr. LAZARO (Peru), speaking in explanation of vote, said that in voting for the draft resolution, his delegation had wished to reaffirm its recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination. At the same time, he wished to point out that the words "in all its forms and by all available means" and paragraph 5 did not reflect the current situation in the Middle East and contradicted the last preambular paragraph.

53. Mr. SHARP (Australia) said that he had abstained from voting for several reasons. It was disappointing that the text of paragraph 5 did not take into account the significance of the agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization. It was also disappointing that the text did not make greater reference to recent developments in Mozambique. Paragraph 15 referred to the refugee problem in Lesotho, but his delegation wished to draw attention to the serious problems of refugees and displaced persons in many other African countries. Finally, his delegation was disappointed that the text did not adequately acknowledge the process of transition to democracy in South Africa.

54. Mr. ASAHI (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the draft resolution did not fully reflect the positive developments in the Middle East or the constructive efforts made by concerned parties in South Africa to move the country towards democracy.

55. Mr. SABOIA (Brazil) said that his delegation's positive vote underlined its strong support for the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination. Nevertheless, his delegation was of the opinion that positive developments in South Africa and the Middle East had not been sufficiently taken into account.

56. Mr. JAAFARI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to contribute to South Africa's progress towards the realization of the right of the South African people to self-determination.

57. With respect to the last preambular paragraph, he pointed out that the evolution which the text qualified as "positive" had occurred outside the legitimate framework for peace, namely, the Madrid Conference, whose work had not yet been completed. His delegation therefore saw nothing positive in that "evolution".

58. Mr. AL-SABID (Kuwait) said that, although he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, his delegation had found it difficult to accept paragraph 6, because it believed that support to the Palestinian people should not be provided solely through the Palestine Liberation Organization.

59. Mr. LAZARO (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it recognized the various moves towards peace, freedom and equality in many parts of the world.

60. Mr. MAQUIERA (Chile) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to reiterate his delegation's permanent support for the self-determination of peoples. However, paragraphs 2 and 5 did not fully reflect the peace process currently under way.

61. Mr. ALVAREZ (Uruguay) said that his delegation had abstained from voting because, although it endorsed the spirit of the draft resolution, it did not believe that reference should be made to specific States.

62. Mr. MRA (Myanmar) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution but considered that it should have reflected the positive developments which had taken place in the Middle East and South Africa.

AGENDA ITEM 108: RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION (continued)

(b) EFFECTIVE REALIZATION OF THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION THROUGH AUTONOMY (continued)

Draft decision A/C.3/48/L.17: Effective realization of the right of self-determination through autonomy; and proposed amendment A/C.3/48/L.25

63. The CHAIRMAN said that Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Costa Rica, Estonia, Nigeria, Poland, Ukraine, Uruguay and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors of the draft decision.

64. Mr. INUSA (Nigeria), Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu), Mr. STREJCZEK (Poland) and Mr. ANDRIYAKA (Ukraine) withdrew their sponsorship of the draft decision.

65. The CHAIRMAN said that neither the draft decision nor the proposed amendment would have implications for the programme budget.

66. Mrs. FRITSCHE (Liechtenstein), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft decision would enable the delegations concerned to resume their consideration of the very important sub-item at the next session, and expressed regret that some delegations failed to recognize the need for further discussion on the subject.

67. The amendment in document A/C.3/48/L.25 was adopted.

68. Mr. HURST (Antigua and Barbuda) said that the amendment in document A/C.3/48/L.17 showed a thoughtful approach to the problem of ethnic, religious and racial conflicts within States, which had a detrimental effect on the viability of those States and the allocation of resources for development.

69. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that she had been unable to support the amendment, since it ran counter to the intent and valid approach of the draft decision.

70. Mr. ALVAREZ (Uruguay) said that his delegation had maintained its support for the Liechtenstein proposal, the basic purpose of which was to place an unavoidable problem on the agenda.

71. Draft decision A/C.3/48/L.17, as amended, was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 109: SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION AND TO YOUTH, AGEING, DISABLED PERSONS AND THE FAMILY (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.16: Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

72. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the oral revision made by the representative of the Dominican Republic when introducing the draft resolution.

73. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.16, as orally revised, was adopted.

74. Mrs. LIMJUCO (Philippines) said that, if the draft resolution had been open for sponsorship, the Philippines would have become a sponsor.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.7/Rev.1: Towards full integration of persons with disabilities in society: a continuing world programme of action

75. The CHAIRMAN announced that Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Côte d'Ivoire, Iceland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Italy, Myanmar, Norway, Pakistan, Russian Federation and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, recalling that the Philippines had orally revised the draft by adding a new paragraph (d).

76. Mr. AL-SAEID (Kuwait) said that Kuwait would join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

77. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.7/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.11/Rev.1: World Summit for Social Development

78. Mr. MAQUEIRA (Chile) introducing the draft resolution, said that Afghanistan, Bahamas, Belarus, Djibouti, Panama, Philippines, Tajikistan, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had become sponsors and said that the word "Member" should be deleted from paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.

79. Ms. KAMAL (Secretary of the Committee) said that the draft resolution had not required additional resources.

80. Mr. INUSA (Nigeria), Ms. TOLLE (Kenya), Mr. AL-SAEID (Kuwait), Mr. SERGIWA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Ms. SRIVIHOK (Thailand), Mr. SIDDIQ (Sudan), Ms. DIOP (Senegal), Mr. AGGREY (Ghana), Ms. STRÖM (Sweden), Mr. MZUMACHARD (Malawi), Mr. KIM Jac Hon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), Mr. BASNYAT (Nepal), Mr. ALVAREZ (Uruguay) and Mrs. MDZINISO (Swaziland) said that their countries would join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

81. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.11/Rev.1 was adopted.

82. Ms. ARIAS (Colombia) said that she had joined the consensus because the draft resolution dealt specifically with the organization of the Summit, which would greatly facilitate its work. She stressed the importance of regional preparatory meetings.

83. Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) welcomed the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, since Cuba was firmly committed to that cause, adding that reference should have been made to the necessity of regional preparatory meetings.

AGENDA ITEM 110: CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.8: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

84. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had no financial implications for the programme budget.

85. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of),

Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

86. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.8 was adopted by 102 votes to 1, with 43 abstentions.

87. Mr. KUEHL (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that although his country had always supported the work of regional institutions like the Institute, such regional organizations ought to be funded at the regional level and not through the regular budget of the United Nations.

88. Mr. ATABEKOV (Kyrgyzstan) said that had he not been absent at the time of the vote he would have voted for the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.9/Rev.1: Prevention of alien smuggling

89. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.9/Rev.1 and the revised amendments proposed by Cuba in document A/C.3/48/L.20/Rev.1.

90. Ms. SEMAFUMU (Uganda) asked for the consideration of the draft resolution and the amendments to be deferred so that further consultations could be held.

91. Ms. BENNANI (Morocco) requested that in the French version the words "la nécessité d'assurer" in the ninth preambular paragraph should be deleted.

92. Ms. ESPINOSA (Mexico) was concerned that in the Spanish version the expression "alien smuggling" was translated as "tráfico de indocumentados" and that the end of the ninth preambular paragraph contained the words "sus propias fronteras".

93. The CHAIRMAN suggested that a decision on the proposals should be deferred.

94. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.10/Rev.1: Crime prevention and criminal justice

95. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bahamas, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Honduras and Iceland had become sponsors of the draft resolution. He added that the draft had no programme budget implications.

96. Mrs. LIMJUCO (Philippines) said that her delegation had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

97. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 112: INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.18: International action to combat drug abuse and illicit production and trafficking

98. The CHAIRMAN announced that Albania, Egypt, Guyana, Honduras, Myanmar, Pakistan, Turkey and Ukraine had become sponsors of the draft resolution and that the latter had no programme budget implications.

99. Mrs. DROZD (Belarus), Ms. ARGUETA (El Salvador), Mr. ATABEKOV (Kyrgyzstan) and Mrs. LIMJUCO (Philippines) became sponsors of the draft resolution.

100. Draft resolution A/C.3/48/L.18 was adopted without a vote.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

101. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Third Committee should establish an open-ended working group with the task of considering, as a matter of priority, the question of establishing the post of a High Commissioner for Human Rights. The working group would hold its first meeting on 15 November, would conclude its work at the end of the current session of the Committee and would subsequently consider other aspects of applying the recommendations of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. The working group would be chaired by Mr. José Ayala Lasso, Permanent Representative of Ecuador. It would have the use of conference services and would endeavour to reach decisions by consensus.

102. It was so decided.

103. Mr. LI Zhaoxing (China) said that China was prepared to give constructive support to the working group in its task, but expressed serious reservations regarding the proposal that the group should conclude its work by the end of the current session of the Committee, first because there was no indication in the Vienna Declaration as to when the consideration of the question should be completed and secondly because it was an important and complex issue.

104. It was understandable that there were differing opinions among the various interested parties and the attempt should be made to overcome any differences through serious discussions. Setting a time-limit was not conducive to achieving positive results.

105. Mr. SUTOYO (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that the non-aligned countries had always shown flexibility and hoped that other countries would adopt a similar position so that the work of the working group could go ahead. They agreed with the Chairman's suggestion that the working group should conclude its work by the end of the current session of the Committee.

106. Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) expressed serious reservations regarding the conclusion of the work of the working group. Paragraph 18 of section II of the Vienna Declaration set no specific time-limit for concluding the work.

107. Mr. TROTTIER (Canada) was confident that all delegations would work together to ensure that the working group finished its work by the end of the current session of the Committee. His country was ready to contribute to the group in a constructive manner.

108. Mr. SHARP (Australia) endorsed the remarks of the representative of Canada regarding the Chairman's proposed limit to the end of the work of the working group.

109. Mr. MARRERO (United States of America) said that tireless efforts by the Chairman had enabled the Working Group to be established on the basis of three principles: mutual trust, respect for differing views and confidence in the good faith of all participants. That was why his delegation had agreed to support the Chairman's proposal and would approach the task in that spirit.

110. Ms. FOSTIER (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Economic Community, expressed her total agreement with the Chairman's remarks.

111. Mr. BIGGAR (Ireland) said that his delegation had accepted the establishment of the working group in a spirit of compromise and would take a constructive part in its work. He believed that at the end of the current session it would be in a position to decide on the establishment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights. He reserved the right to submit a draft resolution relating to agenda item 114 (b) before the time-limit was up.

112. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) agreed with the Chairman's suggestions as to the way in which the working group would operate.

113. Mr. ASAHI (Japan) recognized the importance of the work of the working group and hoped that its establishment would enable progress to be made on substantive questions.

114. Mr. ROSENBERG (Ecuador) said that his delegation was honoured by the appointment of Mr. Ayala Lasso as Chairman of the working group and called on all delegations to work with him.

115. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the support of all delegations and expressed his confidence that the same constructive spirit would prevail in the working group.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.